

Remarks

The Office mailed the present Official Action on March 29, 2005. The applicants have requested an extension of time to reply to this Official Action, and have paid the requisite fees to extend the period to time to respond to August 29, 2005. The applicant submits that this response fully addresses each and every issue raised by the Office and that the claims, as presented herein, are in condition for allowance.

Status of the claims

In an election made by the application on August 9, 2004, claims 19-22, 27, 29 and 30 were withdrawn. Thus, as it stands, of the 32 claims presented to the Office, claims 1-30 have been canceled and claims 31 and 32 are pending before the Office.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 102

Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,779,153 to Kagle.

The Office has rejected claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,779,153 awarded to Kagle. The applicants traverse this rejection and submit that claims 31 and 32 are clearly patentable over the Kagle reference.

At the onset, the applicant objects to the application of Kagle as a reference in that Kagle is not even related to the technology area of the present invention other than that both the technology described in Kagle and that of the present invention involve the use of rendering HTML oriented pages on a remote device. The Kagle reference is generally focused on the using a hand held device in the creation of web pages to be stored and displayed by a web server. More specifically, Kagle describes a creating a template mapping file using a hand-held device. The template mapping file is used to create an association between a host computer based template file and one or more source files located on the hand-held device. When the hand-held device is

communicatively coupled with the host computer, the source files are merged with the selected template in accordance with the mapping information and thus creating a web page on the web server. This technology is entirely different than the focus of the present invention.

The present invention is directed towards remote devices being enabled to execute server-based applications. In a nut shell, the present invention enables various devices to access server-based applications and to have the user interface for the various server based applications automatically altered for the requesting device. More particularly, the present invention includes the element of receiving an invocation request from a client device that includes information that identifies the client device and a server-based application. The Office alleges that this element is disclosed in Kagle at column 4, lines 32-50 and column 6, lines 66 through column 7, line 16. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Kagle does not describe, suggest or teach in any part of the specification the element of receiving an invocation request that both identifies the client device and a server-based application. Kagle only teaches selecting a template and creating a template mapping using a hand-held device based application. Thus, this element is not included in Kagle.

Further, the present invention includes the element of selecting an application interface particular to the client device. Again, it would not make sense for Kagle to include such an element in that Kagle does not involve the presentment of a server-based application to a client device and thus, does not require the selection of an application interface particular to the client device. Rather, Kagle teaches the selection of a template for rendering material currently stored on a hand-held device onto a web server. This does not even approach this element of the present invention. The Office alleges that column 5, lines 4-19 and column 9, lines 19-47 disclose this element. Again, the applicant respectfully disagrees. At column 5, Kagle simply

speaks about a method and system for generating web pages based on a compact mapping file created and stored on a hand-held device. Another aspect of Kagle is a simplified layout for a web page suitable for implementation on a hand-held device. The applicant fails to see how this is relevant to "selecting and application interface" for a server-based application being accessed by a client device "that is particular to the client device".

Likewise, the other elements listed by the Office are also not described, suggested or taught in Kagle. Again, please understand that Kagle describe a hand-held device that has content stored thereon. A program on the hand-held device allows a user to select one of a variety of templates for rendering information presently stored on the hand-held device onto a web server. The program allows the user to create a mapping of what hand-held based content goes into the web-server web site, and where it is to be rendered. This in no way is similar to a server based application that is executed from a client device and the application interface is selected based on the identification of the client device and the client device is enabled to invoice the server-based application and providing action requests that are then processed by the server based on the particular client device requesting the action.

As a non-limiting example to help the Office understand a typical application of this invention, suppose that the server-based application is a web version of Microsoft Word. A client device, such as a PDA or cell phone can access the application and the application interface will be modified based on the type of interface. The commands for the server-based application are housed on the server. Thus, if a user invokes an action such as bolding, or underscoring text, the action is sent to the server which then performs the requested action and then renders the results on the client device. Thus, the text displayed on the client device is changed but, the processing was performed on the server.

Thus, the applicant has shown that the use of Kagle as a reference in this case is simply not appropriate and further, that multiple elements recited in the rejected claims are simply not described, suggested or taught in Kagle. Thus, the applicant respectfully requests the Office to remove this ground of rejection.

Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 to *Tsimelzon*

The Office has rejected claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,763,388 awarded to Tsimelzon. The applicants traverse this rejection and submit that claims 31 and 32 are clearly patentable over the Tsimelzon reference.

The Tsimelzon is directed towards a method to allow only portions of a web page to be selected for viewing on a device. The applicants submit that this is completely irrelevant to the present invention. The present invention is directed towards allowing a client device to access and invoke a server based application and to have the application interface for the server-based application to be modified based on the type of client device. The applicants submit that Tsimelzon does not describe, suggest or teach any aspect of the present invention.

For instance, the Office alleges that column 4 lines 36-45 and column 5, lines 51-55 describe the claimed element of invoking the server-based application by sending an invocation request to the server. However, the applicant points out that this reference, as well as the entire Tsimelzon reference only describes sending a request for a web page to a server. This in no way anticipates invoking a server-based application by sending an invocation request. Although the invention described in Tsimelzon may be accomplished by invoking a web based application, it is not performed in accordance with the present invention which as claimed, among other things requires:

receiving an invocation request of a server-based application from the client;

extract client-specific information from the client and the invocation request;
prepare and SGML-based application interface based on the client specific information;
transmit the SGML-based application interface to the client; and
receive a command corresponding to an actuation of an aspect of said SGML-based
application interface and in response to receiving said command prepare a modified SGML-
based application interface and deliver it to the client.

The applicant has carefully reviewed the passages cited by the Office, as well as the entire
Tsimelzon reference and fails to see a description of these elements, as well as others.

Request for Examiner Interview prior to further prosecution

Due to the lack of application of the cited references to the present invention, the
applicant is concerned that the Office may not fully understand and appreciate the scope of the
present invention. Thus, the applicant requests the Office to contact the applicant's attorney
prior to further examination of this case and to set up an interview. During this interview the
applicants would like to present an overall description of the invention request the Office to
present why they believe the cited references are relevant. The applicant does not believe any
further amendments to the claims are required in that multiple elements are simply not described,
suggested or taught in the cited references.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the case be processed to issuance. If the Office has any questions or if there are any actions that can be handled through an Examiner's Amendment, the applicant requests the Office to contact the attorney of record using the below-provided contact information.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Gregory Scott Smith
Reg. No. 40,819
Attorney for Applicant

Smith Frohwein Tempel Greenlee Blaha LLC
PO Box 88148
Atlanta, Georgia 30356
(770) 804-9070
August 29, 2005